

## REMARKS

### *Status of the Claims*

Claims 20, 22-26, 28, 29, 25, 37-44, and 50 are pending with Claims 20, 25, 35, 40 and 50 being independent. Claims 21, 27, 30-34, 36, 42, 45-49, and 51 have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 20, 25, 29, 35, 37, 38, 40, 43, 44 and 50 have been amended. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added.

### *Requested Action*

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding objection and rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### *Claim Objections*

Claims 20 and 32 are objected to because of minor informalities therein and the Examiner makes specific suggestions for overcoming the objections. In response, while not conceding the propriety of the objections, Applicants have amended Claim 20 as suggested by the Examiner and canceled Claim 32 without prejudice, thereby rendering the objections moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

### *Formal Claim Rejections*

Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Examiner suggests amending these claims to read, “A computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program”. In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have amended Claim 50 as suggested by the Examiner and canceled Claim 51 without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

### *Substantive Rejections*

Claims 20, 24-26, 30-32, 35, 39-41, 45-47, 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over newly cited Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publ. No. 2001/0048534) in view of Breidenbach et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publ. No. 2003/0084085). Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tanaka et al. and Breidenbach et al. as applied to Claim 20, and further in view of Ichikawa et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publ. No. 2004/0201727). Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tanaka et al. and Breidenbach et al. as applied to Claim 25, and further in view of Ichikawa et al. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tanaka et al. and Breidenbach et al. as applied to Claim 230, and further in view of Ichikawa et al. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tanaka et al. and Breidenbach et al. as applied to Claim 35, and further in view of Ichikawa et al. Claims 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tanaka et al. and

Breidenbach et al. as applied to Claim 40, and further in view of Ichikawa et al. Claims 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tanaka et al. and Breidenbach et al. as applied to Claim 30, and further in view of Ichikawa et al.

In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejections, Claims 21, 27, 30-34, 36, 42, 45-49, and 51 have been canceled without prejudice and independent Claims 20, 25, 35, 40 and 50 have been amended. Applicants submit that as amended, these claims are allowable for the following reasons.

Independent Claim 20 relates to a printing system in which an image sensing apparatus and a printing apparatus directly communicate with each other, and the printing apparatus prints an image transmitted from the image sensing apparatus. Claim 20 recites that the image sensing apparatus comprises a first reception unit configured to receive function information of the printing apparatus from the printing apparatus, a generation unit, and a first transmission unit. Claim 20 also recites that the printing apparatus comprises a second transmission unit configured to transmit the function information of the printing apparatus from the printing apparatus to the image sensing apparatus, a second reception unit configured to receive the files of the data file and the image file transmitted by the first transmission unit, a correction unit configured to correct image data of the image file received by the first reception unit on the basis of the received data file, and a printing unit configured to print an image in accordance with the image data corrected by the correction unit. The data file is transmitted from the image sensing apparatus to the printing apparatus before the image file is transmitted from the image sensing apparatus to the printing apparatus.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite that the image sensing apparatus comprises an extraction unit configured to analyze image data of an image file to be printed and extract a feature amount of the image data.

Claim 20 has also been amended to recite that the generation unit is configured to generate a data file which is a file independent from the image file and describes the feature amount extracted by the extraction unit.

Claim 20 has been further amended to recite that the kind of the feature amount is determined in accordance with the function information received by the first reception unit. Claim 20 has also been amended to recite that the first transmission unit is configured to transmit files of the data file generated by the generation unit and the image file to the printing apparatus.

In contrast, the citations to Tanaka et al., Breidenbach et al., and Ichikawa et al. are not understood to disclose or suggest the concept of an image sensing apparatus that determines the kind of feature amount extracted from image data to be printed by a printing apparatus in accordance with function information of the printing apparatus received by a first reception unit of the sensing apparatus, as recited by amended Claim 1. In addition, these citations are not understood to disclose or suggest a generation unit configured to generate a data file which is a file independent from an image file and describes the feature amount extracted by the extraction unit, as also recited by amended Claim 1. Rather, the citation to Tanaka et al. is understood to disclose the generating of a print file and an image file, but the print file is understood to merely include designation of an image file to be printed and a printing condition rather than a feature amount which is extracted by analyzing the image file to be printed. The citation to Ichikawa et al. is understood to

disclose the outputting of image data and the WB adaptation rate, i.e., information determined by an automatic white balance function of a camera, rather than a feature amount of an image file extracted by analyzing image data of an image data file. Further, according to Ichikawa et al., the WB adaptation rate is understood to be described as a tag within the image data. Thus, Ichikawa et al. is also understood to fail to teach or suggest outputting the WB adaptation rate as a independent file.

Since the citations to Tanaka et al., Breidenbach et al., and Ichikawa et al. are not understood to disclose or suggest at least one feature of amended Claim 20, the Office is not understood to have yet established a prima facie case of obviousness against amended Claim 20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 20 be withdrawn. And because independent Claims 25, 35, 40 and 50 have been amended in a similar manner, they are submitted to be allowable for similar reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 25, 35, 40 and 50 be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable, due to their dependency from the independent base claims, as well as due to additional features that are recited. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Applicants submit that this Amendment After Final Rejection clearly places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not presented earlier, because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment, as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

*Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the application is now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Any fee required in connection with this paper should be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

---

Gary M. Jacobs  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
GMJ/klm

FCBS\_WS 2183608v1